

## Discovery of 15-second oscillations in *Hubble Space Telescope* observations of WZ Sagittae following the 2001 outburst<sup>1</sup>

C. Knigge<sup>2</sup>, R. I. Hynes<sup>2</sup>, D. Steeghs<sup>2</sup>, K. S. Long<sup>3</sup>, S. Araujo-Betancor<sup>2</sup>, T. R. Marsh<sup>2</sup>

christian@astro.soton.ac.uk, rih@astro.soton.ac.uk, ds@astro.soton.ac.uk,  
long@stsci.edu, sab@astro.soton.ac.uk, trm@astro.soton.ac.uk

### ABSTRACT

We report the discovery of 15-s oscillations in ultraviolet observations of WZ Sge obtained with the *Hubble Space Telescope* approximately one month after the peak of the 2001 outburst. This is the earliest detection of oscillations in WZ Sge following an outburst and the first time that a signal near 15 s has been seen to be dominant. The oscillations are quite strong (amplitude  $\simeq 5\%$ ), but not particularly coherent. In one instance, the oscillation period changed by 0.7 s between successive observations separated by less than 1 hour. We have also found evidence for weaker signals with periods near 6.5 s in some of our data. We discuss the implications of our results for the models that have been proposed to account for the 28-s oscillations seen in quiescence. If the periods of the 15-s oscillations can be identified with the periods of revolution of material rotating about the white dwarf, the mass of the white dwarf must satisfy  $M_{WD} > 0.71 M_{\odot}$ . The corresponding limit for the 6.5-s signals is  $M_{WD} > 1.03 M_{\odot}$ .

*Subject headings:* accretion, accretion disks — binaries: close — novae, cataclysmic variables — stars: individual: WZ Sge

---

<sup>1</sup>Based on observations with the NASA/ESA Hubble Space Telescope, obtained at the Space Telescope Science Institute, which is operated by the Association of Universities for Research in Astronomy, Inc. under NASA contract No. NAS5-26555.

<sup>2</sup>Department of Physics & Astronomy, University of Southampton, Highfield, Southampton SO17 1BJ, UK

<sup>3</sup>Space Telescope Science Institute, 3700 San Martin Drive, Baltimore, MD 21218, USA

## 1. Introduction

The dwarf nova WZ Sge is arguably the most extreme cataclysmic variable (CV) known. Whereas other dwarf novae undergo 3-5 magnitude eruptions every few weeks or months, WZ Sge’s outbursts have an amplitude of 7-8 magnitudes and recur on a time-scale of roughly 33 years. WZ Sge’s 82 minute orbital period is also one of the shortest of any CV, its mass ratio is one of the lowest ( $q = M_2/M_{WD} \simeq 0.05$ ; Steeghs et al. 2001) and its time-averaged absolute magnitude one of the faintest ( $M_V \simeq 11.5$ ; Patterson 1998). All of these facts suggest that WZ Sge is a highly evolved CV whose secondary is probably a brown dwarf-like object (Patterson 1998).

Many studies of WZ Sge in quiescence have found oscillations near 28 s (Robinson, Nather & Patterson 1978; Patterson 1980; Skidmore et al. 1997; Welsh et al. 1997; Patterson et al. 1998 [P98]; Skidmore et al. 1999 [S99]). However, the origin of these oscillations is still unclear: Robinson et al. (1978) and S99 favour a ZZ Ceti-like, pulsating white dwarf (WD) model, but Patterson (1980) and P98 prefer an oblique magnetic rotator model. A modified version of the latter model has recently been proposed by Warner & Woudt (2002 [W02]; also see Section 4).

Here, we report the discovery of 15-s oscillations in HST observations of WZ Sge obtained roughly 1 month after the start of its 2001 outburst. This is the earliest detection of rapid oscillations following an outburst of the system (Patterson et al. 1981).

## 2. Observations

WZ Sge went into outburst on July 23, 2001 (Ishioka et al. 2001). The ensuing multi-wavelength campaign included two *Hubble Space Telescope* (HST) *Director’s Discretionary Time* (DDT) programs. The HST observations analysed here were obtained with the *Space Telescope Imaging Spectrograph* (STIS) during the first DDT program. The goal of this program was to cover the immediate aftermath of the outburst in the FUV, with three observing epochs on Aug 8, Aug 19 and Aug 22. Each epoch consisted of 4 consecutive HST orbits. The bulk of the observing time in each epoch was used to obtain time-resolved, high-resolution, FUV spectroscopy of WZ Sge with the E140M echelle grating dispersing the light onto the FUV-MAMA detectors operating in TIME-TAG mode. This set-up covers the region 1150 Å – 1700 Å at a spectral resolution of 45,800. Due to overheads, FUV exposure times in the first and third orbit of each epoch are shorter than those in the second and fourth orbits.

Figure 1 illustrates the timing of the HST observations relative to the optical outburst

light curve. Following the nomenclature of Patterson et al. (2002), we see that the first of our HST observations occurred during the plateau phase of the outburst, the second during the ensuing dip and the third near the peak of the first echo outburst.

### 3. Analysis

Since our focus here is on the search for rapid oscillations, we constructed “white light” light curves at 1-s time resolution directly from the TIME-TAG files. These files contain a list of the arrival times and detector positions of all recorded photon events. The backgrounds due to dark current and geocoronal emission are negligible in our data, so the resulting light curves are ideally suited for studying the short-timescale variability of WZ Sge.

The raw FUV light curves immediately revealed the presence of strong, rapid oscillations in Epoch 3, though not in Epochs 1 and 2. The Epoch 3 light curves are shown in Figure 2. A roughly 5% oscillation with period near 15 s is easily visible. The oscillation amplitude is clearly variable (e.g. note the weakness of the oscillations around  $t = 700$  s and  $t = 12,400$  s). However, there is no obvious link between oscillation amplitude and orbital phase  $\phi_{orb}$  (computed from the ephemeris of P98; inferior conjunction of the secondary corresponds to  $\phi_{orb} \simeq -0.046$  [Steehns et al. 2001]).

Figure 3 shows the discrete Fourier transform of each HST orbit within Epoch 3. As expected, signals near 15 s are easily seen in all data subsets. No obvious signals are seen at frequencies corresponding to periods around 30 s. In particular, there is no convincing evidence for the 27.87-s signal that is the most stable clock in quiescence (P98), nor for any “subharmonics” of the dominant 15-s signals. Figure 3 also reveals that the oscillation period is variable. Most noticeably, the dominant period in Orbit 1 is  $P_1 = 13.93$  s, but this has changed to  $P_2 = 14.67$  s in Orbit 2.

Signals with periods of about 6.5 s are also present in Orbits 1 and 3. If these are harmonics of signals near the dominant 15-s periods, then at least in the case of the 6.43-s signal in Orbit 1, the harmonic has to dominate strongly over the fundamental. The 6.5-s oscillations appear to be strongest when the 15-s oscillations are weakest. Thus in the raw light curves (Figure 2), the 6.5-s oscillations are only discernible when the main signal is weak, e.g. near  $t = 700$  s and  $t = 12,400$  s.

In order to analyse the time evolution of the 15-s oscillations more carefully, we carried out sliding sinusoid fits to successive chunks of the Epoch 3 light curve. The model was a constant period sinusoid superposed on a constant DC offset,  $y(t) = a \cos(2\pi ft - \phi) + \text{DC}$ . In practice,  $f$  was always fixed to the dominant frequency in each orbit (see Figure 3). The

fits were carried out to successive 45-s chunks of data, with no overlap. The phase of the first chunk in each orbit was arbitrarily set to  $180^\circ$ .

The results are shown in Figure 4. There appears to be no connection between the amplitude of the oscillations and the average flux (the DC offset). The median oscillation amplitude is 530 c/s; the median ratio of the amplitude to the DC offset is 5.0%. The obvious phase variability in Figure 3 confirms that the oscillation period is variable. More specifically, given the form of our model, a linear phase shift implies that the true period differs from the trial period. Any non-linearity in the phase plots is a sign that the oscillation period is changing. For example, a transition from one linear portion to another indicates a switch from one period to another. The phase plots in Figure 4 clearly show such transitions, usually on time-scales shorter than we can resolve. We emphasise, however, that our fits assume a *single*, sinusoidal signal. If *several* signals are present simultaneously, the results of such a fit will depend on the relative amplitudes of the signals and the closeness of their periods to that assumed in the fit.

#### 4. Discussion

We begin our discussion by summarising the key properties of the 15-s oscillations we have discovered:

- (i) they were found in data obtained 1 month after the start of WZ Sge’s 2001 outburst, just past the peak of the first echo outburst;
- (ii) they are strong, with fractional amplitudes around 5%;
- (iii) their periods are about a factor of two shorter than those of the 28-s oscillations seen in quiescence; the latter are not seen in our data;
- (iv) they exhibit phase jitter consistent with small, possibly discontinuous period changes.

In addition, we have discovered 6.5-s oscillations in two of our four HST orbits.

These properties are unusual. Oscillations in WZ Sge have previously only been seen in data obtained in quiescence. Their periods are typically 28 s – 29 s (S99), with the most stable signal lying at 28.87 s (P98). Oscillations near 15 s have only been seen once before (Provencal & Nather 1995), but never as the dominant signal. Finally, no oscillation with

$P \simeq 6.5$  s has ever been reported in WZ Sge.<sup>4</sup>

It is interesting that the dominant periods in our data are roughly half of those seen in quiescence. However, only the period determined for Orbit 1 could be harmonically related with the 27.87 s signal ( $2 \times 13.93$  s = 27.86 s). Among other periods reported in the literature (see Table 2 in S99), the closest harmonic matches to the periods in our data are: 29.33 s (Orbit 2:  $2 \times 14.67$  s = 29.34 s); 29.10 s (Orbit 3:  $2 \times 14.60$  s = 29.20 s); 29.69 s (Orbit 4:  $2 \times 14.78$  s = 29.56 s). However,  $\sim 10$  apparently distinct periods around 28 s/29 s have been reported, so the statistical significance of these near matches is unclear. Figure 3 certainly reveals no evidence of any  $\simeq 29$ -s fundamental periods in our data. Moreover, if the peaks in Figure 3 near 6.5 s are also interpreted as harmonics, the corresponding fundamentals (Orbit 1:  $4 \times 6.43$  s = 25.72 s; Orbit 3:  $4 \times 6.64$  s = 26.56 s) have no counterparts among previously reported periods.

It seems unlikely that the oscillations in our data can be due to ZZ Ceti-like WD pulsations. A preliminary analysis of the mean FUV spectrum obtained during Epoch 2 (only 3 days before Epoch 3), suggests  $T_{WD} \simeq 25,000$  K (Kuulkers et al. 2001; K.S. Long 2002, private communication). This is well beyond the blue edge of the ZZ Ceti instability strip at  $T_{WD} \simeq 13,500$  K (for  $M_{WD} \simeq 0.8 M_{\odot}$ ; Bradley & Winget 1994). However, we cannot rule out the pulsation model definitively, because the response of a pulsating WD to the heating and compression it experiences during a dwarf nova outburst is unknown.

In order to examine the magnetic rotator model, we need some constraints on the accretion rate through the disk in outburst, relative to the quiescent value. Patterson et al. (2002) find that the mass transfer rate *from the secondary* in quiescence is  $\dot{M}_2 \sim 10^{15}$  g/s. The quiescent rate must therefore satisfy  $\dot{M}_q \ll 10^{15}$  g/s, and we will adopt  $\dot{M}_q < 2 \times 10^{14}$  g/s as a conservative upper limit. The quiescent x-ray luminosity of WZ Sge is  $L_x \simeq 10^{30}$  ergs/s (Eracleous, Halpern & Patterson 1991; Mukai & Shiokawa 1993).<sup>5</sup> Since the x-rays probably arise in the boundary layer, they can represent at most half of the total quiescent accretion power, i.e.  $L_x \leq (GM_{WD}\dot{M}_q)/(2R_{WD})$ . Using the Nauenberg (1972) approximation to the Hamada-Salpeter (1961) WD mass-radius, this yields a lower limit  $\dot{M}_q \gtrsim 2 \times 10^{12}$  g/s. By contrast, a preliminary disk model fit to the time-averaged FUV spectrum obtained in our Epoch 3 suggests  $\dot{M}_{E3} \simeq 3 \times 10^{16}$  g/s (K.S. Long 2002, private communication). Thus the accretion rate in Epoch 3 exceeded the quiescent rate by a factor in the range 150 – 15,000.

---

<sup>4</sup>We note in passing that Eracleous, Patterson & Halpern (1991) found marginal evidence for a 9.56-s periodicity in Einstein x-ray data.

<sup>5</sup>The quoted value for  $L_x$  has been adjusted to reflect the recent parallax-based distance estimate of  $d \simeq 45$  pc (J.R. Thorstensen 2002, private communication)

This immediately rules out a standard intermediate polar (IP) model for the oscillations. This is because for a WD satisfying  $M_{WD} > 0.7 M_{\odot}$  (Steeghs et al. 2001), the 27.87-s oscillations correspond to Keplerian periods at  $R < 2R_{WD}$ . This presumably marks the inner edge of the quiescent disk in the IP model. However, the magnetospheric radius of an accreting magnetic WD scales as  $R_m \propto \dot{M}^{-\frac{2}{7}}$  (dipole) and  $R_m \propto \dot{M}^{-\frac{2}{11}}$  (quadrupole) (e.g. W02). With  $\dot{M}_{E3}/\dot{M}_q > 150$ , the magnetosphere should thus have been completely crushed onto the WD surface during Epoch 3.

W02 have recently proposed an alternative magnetic rotator model. They envisage the magnetic field being anchored in an equatorial accretion belt surrounding the WD. This belt has a relatively low moment of inertia, so its angular velocity can respond quickly to changes in  $\dot{M}$ . Their model predicts a much weaker dependence of  $R_m$  on  $\dot{M}$ , because the belt’s magnetic field scales as  $B \propto \Omega^{1/2} M_b^{1/4}$ , where  $\Omega$  is the angular velocity and  $M_b$  the mass of the belt (W02). According to W02, the resulting dependence of oscillation period  $P$  on  $\dot{M}$  can be as weak as  $P \propto \dot{M}^{-1/10}$  during an outburst. Thus the outburst/quiescence period ratio of about 0.5 corresponds to a ratio of accretion rates of roughly 1000 in their model. This is within the allowed range.<sup>6</sup>

W02 account differently for what they call “period discontinuities”, i.e. relatively small period changes on short time-scales. They propose that the accretion belt is rotating differentially, with  $\Omega$  decreasing away from the equator. The instantaneous oscillation period is then determined by which part of the belt is currently being “fed”. Period discontinuities occur as magnetic reconnection events switch the feeding from one belt region to another. The upshot is that only longer-term period changes reflect changes in  $\dot{M}$ . In WZ Sge, the change in period between quiescence and outburst would then probably reflect a change in  $\dot{M}$ , but the smaller changes within Epoch 3 would be caused by magnetic reconnection events on the differentially rotating accretion belt.

The ability of the W02 model to account for both the long-term and short-term period changes is encouraging. However, the model owes its success at least partly to the sheer complexity of the mechanism(s) it uses to explain different observational features. Also, we have not even attempted to explain the 6.5-s signals in some of our data, nor the weak-

---

<sup>6</sup>This argument assumes that the roughly 2:1 period ratio reflects a change in the *fundamental* oscillation period. If it reflects a switch from the fundamental to the first harmonic, the fundamental must be almost unchanged between outburst and quiescence. Given the huge change in  $\dot{M}$  between these states, this would seem hard to explain in any model in which the oscillation period is partly determined by the ram pressure of the accreting material.

ness/absence of the oscillations during Epochs 1 and 2.<sup>7</sup> We therefore feel that the origin of the WZ Sge’s oscillations remains an open question.

We finally note that the oscillations can be used to set a lower limit on the WD mass, under the assumption that their periods they can be identified with the periods of revolution of material rotating about the white dwarf. The shortest possible Keplerian period around a WD of mass  $M_{WD}$  and radius  $R_{WD}$  is

$$P_{K,min} = \frac{2\pi R_{WD}}{(GM_{WD}/R_{WD})^{1/2}}. \quad (1)$$

Again using the Nauenberg (1972) mass-radius relation for cold WDs, we find a lower limit of  $M_{WD} > 0.71 M_{\odot}$  for our shortest dominant period of 13.93 s and  $M_{WD} > 1.03 M_{\odot}$  for the weaker 6.43-s signal seen in Orbit 1. Both limits are consistent with the constraint  $M_{WD} > 0.70 M_{\odot}$  imposed by the spectroscopic mass function (Steehns et al. 2001).

This work was supported by NASA through grant G0-9287 from the Space Telescope Science Institute, which is operated by AURA, Inc., under NASA contract NAS5-26555. DS and SAB are supported by a PPARC Fellowship and Studentship, respectively. RIH is supported by Grant F/00-180/A from the Leverhulme Trust. We are grateful to the VSNET collaboration for providing us with the data shown in Figure 1. We would finally like to thank the many colleagues and amateur observers who have contributed to the 2001/2002 campaign on WZ Sge.

## REFERENCES

- Bradley, P. A. & Winget, D. E. 1994, ApJ, 421, 236
- Eracleous, M., Halpern, J., & Patterson, J. 1991, ApJ, 382, 290
- Eracleous, M., Patterson, J., & Halpern, J. 1991, ApJ, 370, 330
- Hamada, T. & Salpeter, E. E. 1961, ApJ, 134, 683
- Ishioka, R. et al. 2001, IAU Circ., 7669, 1
- Ishioka, R. et al. 2002, A&A, 381, L41

---

<sup>7</sup>We have not yet carried out an exhaustive analysis of the Epoch 1 and 2 observations, but it is clear that there are no signals of comparable strength in these data sets.

- Kuulkers, E., Knigge, C., Steeghs, D., Wheatley, P. J., & Long, K. S. 2002, ASP Conf. Ser. 261: The Physics of Cataclysmic Variables and Related Objects, 443 (astro-ph/0110064)
- Mukai, K. & Shiokawa, K. 1993, ApJ, 418, 863
- Nauenberg, M. 1972, ApJ, 175, 417
- Patterson, J. 1980, ApJ, 241, 235
- Patterson, J., McGraw, J. T., Coleman, L., & Africano, J. L. 1981, ApJ, 248, 1067
- Patterson, J. 1998, PASP, 110, 1132
- Patterson, J., Richman, H., Kemp, J., & Mukai, K. 1998, PASP, 110, 403 [P98]
- Patterson, J. et al. 2002, PASP, 114, 721
- Provencal, J. L. & Nather, R. E. 1997, ASSL Vol. 214: White dwarfs, 67
- Robinson, E. L., Nather, R. E., & Patterson, J. 1978, ApJ, 219, 168
- Skidmore, W., Welsh, W. F., Wood, J. H., & Stiening, R. F. 1997, MNRAS, 288, 189
- Skidmore, W., Welsh, W. F., Wood, J. H., Catalán, M. S., & Horne, K. 1999, MNRAS, 310, 750 [S99]
- Steeghs, D., Marsh, T., Knigge, C., Maxted, P. F. L., Kuulkers, E., & Skidmore, W. 2001, ApJ, 562, L145
- Warner, B. & Woudt, P. A. 2002, MNRAS, in press [W02] (astro-ph/0204484)
- Welsh, W. F., Skidmore, W., Wood, J. H., Cheng, F. H., & Sion, E. M. 1997, MNRAS, 291, L57



Fig. 1.— The VSNET optical light curve of the 2001 outburst of WZ Sge (see Ishioka et al. 2002). The three HST observing epochs are marked by arrows.

Fig. 2.— The FUV light curves for the four HST orbits in Epoch 3. Note that Orbits 2 and 4 yielded longer time series than Orbits 1 and 3, so the x-axis for these orbits spans a longer time interval.

Fig. 3.— Discrete Fourier transforms of the individual orbits in Epoch 3. Ordinates correspond to the amplitudes of pure sinusoids. The dominant frequencies near 15 s and 6.5 s (if present) are marked. The arrows show the expected locations of the “subharmonics” of these signals. The dotted line marks the frequency of the 28.87-s signal often seen in quiescence.

Fig. 4.— The results of the sliding sinusoid fits to the Epoch 3 data. Each point represent the result of a sinusoid fit to a 45-s data chunk; there is no overlap between successive chunks. The periods of the sine waves were always fixed at the dominant period of the corresponding orbit (see Figure 3). The top panels shows the DC offset levels (effectively the mean count rate within each chunk). The middle panels show the oscillation amplitudes, and the bottom panels show the oscillation phases (see text for details). The error bars correspond to the formal  $1\text{-}\sigma$  errors returned by the least squares fits.







